UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2487th MEETING: 25 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2487)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Grenada: Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067) ...	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2487th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 25 October 1983, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2487)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Grenada:
   Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Grenada:
Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letters from the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Grenada, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico and Venezuela in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jacobs (Grenada), took a place at the Council table; Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico) and Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

3. The Security Council is meeting in response to requests contained in two letters dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua to the President of the Council. The first is in document S/16067. Members of the Council have received photocopies of the second, which will be distributed as document S/16072 at 0600 hours tomorrow.

4. The Council has before it document S/16068, which contains the text of a letter dated 25 October from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the President of the Council, and document S/16069, which contains the text of a letter dated 25 October from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua to the Council President.

5. Council members have received photocopies of the following communications, which will be distributed as Council documents at 0600 hours tomorrow: two letters dated 25 October from the representative of Saint Lucia, which will be issued under the symbols S/16070 and S/16073, respectively; a letter dated 25 October from the representative of Grenada to the President of the Council, which will be issued as document S/16075; and a letter dated 25 October from the representative of the United States of America to the Council President, which will be issued under the symbol S/16076.

6. The first speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I welcome the fact that you are presiding over our work with the effectiveness and impartiality which have always been your hallmark.

8. I wish to thank the members of the Council for being so kind as to meet the request of the Government of Mexico so that we could take part in this debate, which is of direct concern to the countries of our region. The events that bring this about call to mind painful precedents in the history of the Latin American peoples and come in the wake of conflicts and tensions that severely affect peace and security in Central America and the Caribbean.

9. The Council has been convened in an acute emergency. It would have been desirable for this meeting to have been held before the events that, we regret, actually happened. There are important antecedents of preventive action by the Council which, although they may not always have prevented the rules of the Charter from being violated, have served to alert international public opinion and to guide the subsequent action of this body.

10. We shall continue to stress the need for the Council to take up, in due time, consideration of imminent events which fall within its purview. For about a week things were happening in the southern Caribbean which led one to suppose that there was a threat to the integrity of Grenada. Unfortunately, the Council was in no position to act as early as would have been desirable. We are facing *faits accomplis*. A military force of the United States, supported by Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, has disembarked on the territory of Grenada and begun hostilities against its inhabitants, invoking arguments, both general and particular, which are totally unacceptable.

11. What we have here is a clear violation of the essential norms of international law. This is a flagrant act of aggression against the territorial integrity of a State. It is obvious interference in the internal affairs of another country and a manifest denial of the right of peoples to self-determination.

12. Mexico unreservedly condemns the intervention and the military invasion, which lack any justification. The events to which I refer are unquestionably a violation of the basic principles of the United Nations, in particular Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, where it is set forth that Members shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

13. Under regional agreements, there can be no way to legitimize such events. The charter of the Organization of American States, in article 18, provides that "No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State."

14. No convention or subregional understanding can run counter to those rules. The act of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) only provides for collective defence measures against external aggression, based explicitly on Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which provides as a requirement for such measures the existence of an armed attack from outside, which clearly is not the case. None of those instruments authorizes, furthermore, the intervention by another State in the internal affairs of the region.

15. The international community has repeatedly appealed to all States to make a positive contribution to a peaceful negotiated settlement to the disputes in Central America and the Caribbean. The efforts made by various Latin American countries to this end must be supported by the cessation of foreign interference and a total prohibition of the threat or use of force.

16. Considering the delicate consequences that these events might have on future developments in the region and on the internal processes of the Latin American countries, we urge the Security Council to take the necessary measures to have foreign troops withdrawn immediately. The people of Grenada alone is allowed freely to decide its form of government, without foreign interference.

17. The events to which we refer are part of a cycle of threats and pressures designed to limit the exercise of national rights by peoples in the region. Appeals to harmony and the promotion of a multi-faceted order which could reconcile and include the processes proper to each Central American nation and each Caribbean nation seem to be less and less heeded by those who seek to impose from without an order suiting their own interests.

18. We are living through a particularly difficult time, when the tendency to use force in the quest for new balances of power is becoming more acute. This is happening because of an alleged fragile nuclear paralysis and takes the form of continual acts of aggression against developing countries which lack the means necessary to provide for their own defence. Should such escalation continue, the enforcement of the Charter of the United Nations as a whole would be left pending. Expectations for independence and progress among the developing countries would be null and void. Collective security would be in disarray everywhere and the possibilities of universal conflagration would be increasingly close.

19. It is essential to put an end to this race for strategic and military domination by the imposition of political models and the dominance of ideological dogmatism. Political reason must be brought to bear, together with a spirit of civilized coexistence; and diplomatic means and the norms of international law must be invoked as invariable guidelines for the conduct of inter-State relations.

20. Mr. TINOCO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Today international public opinion has been shocked by international press dispatches concerning the implementation of previously formulated plans by the United States Administration to invade the small island of Grenada, with the political assistance and the symbolic presence of military forces of other countries in the region, designed to give its action the appearance of legality—legality which it obviously lacks.

21. This is a manifestation of the principles on which United States foreign policy rests. It is an expression of the danger that the concept of "vital interests" of the United States has come to constitute for countries that, for reasons of their own development, have removed themselves from the sphere of United States domination and have become independent nations. But, above all, it is a concrete form of the concept of international legal order that, with the mentality of the present United States Government, takes into account only the security of that country, to whatever degree its leaders, with their idea of morality, wish to take it.

22. Grenada is a State in the international community, a member of the Organization of American States (OAS) and a Member of the United Nations. The fact that it belongs to sub-regional organizations does not in any way detract from or affect its duties and rights under the Charter of the United Nations and other norms of international law. It is not, nor could it be, the purpose of these sub-regional organizations to encourage or facilitate the violation of the principles and norms of international law or to

make distorted and ill-intentioned interpretations of treaties and conventions in force.

23. The President of the United States, in a desperate attempt to give legality to the interventionist military actions against Grenada, has invoked the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, of which Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Monserrat, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines are members. It is unacceptable to invoke or interpret that treaty as allowing for the creation of a situation of intervention in Grenada's internal affairs.

24. It is significant that today the United States is, as President Reagan himself said this morning, basing its invasionist activities on a treaty to which the United States is not a party.

25. It might be worth asking the United States delegation this question: since when, according to the international legal order, has it been lawful for several countries to get together and agree to invade another country with which they are not in a state of war and to which only internal difficulties can be ascribed?

26. Might it not then be logical to think that the recent meeting at which the Central American Defence Council (CONDECA) was reorganized—the meeting held in Guatemala under United States auspices—was the prelude to an invasion of Nicaragua and El Salvador, which could open the way to a prolonged war between the Central Americans and the United States?

27. The United States has called for a meeting of CONDECA this week in Tegucigalpa. The military leaders of Guatemala and Honduras, together with the head of the Southern Command of the United States in Panama, have an appointment in that city at the very moment when thousands of United States soldiers are occupying Honduras and there are 17,000 other troops in the fleet of ships stationed off the coasts of Nicaragua.

28. I revert now to the attempts to justify action that is indefensible from any point of view. Article 14 of the charter of the Organization of American States states: "The right of each State to protect itself and to live its own life does not authorize it to commit unjust acts against another State." We do not understand how the United States Administration can try to evade the real meaning of that rule, set forth in a legal order of which it is a signatory.

29. We maintain that to prevent the State of Grenada and its people from exercising the rights conferred on them by the OAS charter, in article 3, and to prevent them from enjoying the protection of Articles 2 and 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and the protection of other relevant provisions of international law, is obviously unjust; and those who allow the United States to carry out such an interventionist—invasionist act on their behalf share the historic responsibilities flowing from the commission of such an act.

30. Nor can we disregard the risk that all the independent countries of the world run when, against all legal logic, absolutely irrelevant treaties are invoked to support *de facto* situations that constitute infringements of all universally accepted concepts of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, while, on the other hand, agreements and treaties that call for a certain kind of international behaviour are ignored.

31. It is clear that in this case all the pretexts adduced by the United States Administration are inadmissible—that is, the protection of United States citizens on the island, the prevention of greater chaos and helping in the restoration of order, governmental institutions and democracy.

32. Yesterday, President Reagan's spokesman said that United States citizens were not in any danger in Grenada. Furthermore, relatives of the United States citizens resident in Grenada asked the United States President not to take any steps that might put their lives in danger.

33. It would be hard for interventionist troops to avoid eventual chaos and restore order in Grenada when their real purpose is to impose plans for subjection and forms of Government which meet the strategic American interests. We must recall that these are the purposes of the restoration of democracy, "American democracy"; they are the same as those which underlay the American interventions in Guatemala, Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Chile and which at present underlie the overt and covert actions being carried out against the State of Nicaragua.

34. In any case there is no possible argument to justify this shameless intervention against a sovereign State. There are means and methods sanctioned by international law of which a State can make use in situations of disputes among two or more States, but none of these contemplate the right of intervention. The United States has available to it a number of legal instruments, treaties and conventions that it could use in a civilized manner to settle the disputes or difficulties in which it considers itself involved.

35. Article IV of the Convention of 23 December 1936, to which the United States is a signatory and by which it is therefore bound, establishes the rights of States in the event of disputes. Perhaps it is not too late to learn lessons applied elsewhere in the world. Article IV states:

> "The high contracting parties further agree that, in the case of a dispute among two or more of them, they will seek settlement in a spirit of mutual respect for their respective rights, being able for this purpose to have recourse to direct diplomatic negotiations or alternative processes of mediation, commissions of inquiry, commissions of conciliation, arbitration courts and courts of justice, according to what is provided for in the treaties to which they are parties. They further agree that, if settlement of the dispute is impossible by diplomatic negotiations and if the States in order to reach a settlement must have recourse to the other procedures provided for in this article, they shall inform the other signatory States of that fact and of the progress of the negotiations."

36. By intervening militarily in Grenada, the United States has also violated the Anti-War Treaty (Non-Aggression and Conciliation),[1] signed at Rio de Janeiro on 10 October 1933, article I of which states:

> "The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that they condemn wars of aggression in their mutual relations or against other States and that the settlement of disputes and controversies shall be effected solely through the peaceful means established by International Law."

Article III of the same Treaty of Non-Aggression and Conciliation, to which the United States is a party and by which it is therefore bound, reads as follows:

> "In case any of the States engaged in the dispute fails to comply with the obligations set forth in the foregoing Articles, the Contracting States undertake to make every effort in their power for the maintenance of peace. To that end, and in their character of neutrals, they shall adopt a common and solidary attitude: they shall exercise the political, juridical or economic means authorized by International Law; they shall bring the influence of public opinion to bear; but in no case shall they resort to intervention either diplomatic or armed. . . ."

37. The Government of the United States, with this invasion of Grenada, has also violated the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Re-establishment of Peace,[2] of 23 December 1936, which has been in force and binding upon the United States since 25 August 1937. Its Additional Protocol relative to Non-intervention[3] states the following in article I:

> "The High Contracting Parties declare inadmissible the intervention by any one of them, directly or indirectly, and for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of any other of the Parties."

38. Furthermore, the United States has violated the following provisions of the charter of the Organization of American States. Article 18 states the following:

> "No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic, and cultural elements."

In invading Grenada, the United States has also violated Article 20, which reads as follows:

> "The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. . . ."

That means: not even for five or six days. Article 21 of the same charter reads as follows:

> "The American States bind themselves in their international relations not to have recourse to the use of force, except in the case of self-defence in accordance with existing treaties or in fulfilment thereof."

39. Finally, Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations states:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

40. All the aforementioned treaties and conventions have been duly signed and ratified by the United States, whose State Department has included them among the treaties in force at present. This means that, in accordance with Article VI of the United States Constitution, these are the supreme law of the land, a concept which involves the obligation of members of the Government of the United States to abide by them and to implement them. Hence it derives from their violation that the present United States Administration has not only placed the United States in the category of a State which is internationally delinquent but also has led the United States to violate its own Constitution and laws.

41. The fact that the use of force is increasing is alarming, together with the use of military intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. Governments hostile to the emancipation of peoples continue to violate the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries.

42. As this time, we only have to remember some of the most relevant aspects of the history of acts of aggression and intervention by the United States against Latin America. I shall be very brief and give just a few fundamental examples. In 1846, President Polk ordered troops to occupy the territory claimed by Mexico in what is now Texas, thus beginning the Mexican war. The United States annexed the land under dispute, besides California and New Mexico, after its victory in 1848. In 1854 American Marines destroyed the Nicaraguan port city of Greystone in order to avenge the holding of an American minister in that country. In 1855, the freebooters of William Walker came to Nicaragua for the purpose of annexing the whole of Central America to the southern states of the United States. Walker proclaimed himself president and established slavery in Nicaragua—real slavery. That same year, Colonels Kinneys and Fabens, in active service, proclaimed the so-called independence of San Juan del Norte, sovereign territory of Nicaragua.

43. In 1873—just to give a few of the most signal dates—during the struggle of Panama to gain independence from Colombia, American troops intervened in that country. There were similar disembarkations in 1885, 1901, 1902 and 1903. In 1898 the navy blockaded Cuban ports in the Spanish-American War, in which the army and volunteers were also involved. In 1904, the Marines disembarked in Ancon and other points in Panama. That was the year that

Theodore Roosevelt drew up the "Roosevelt Corollary", in other words, the policy of the great stranglehold. In 1909, the United States intervened in Nicaragua in order to overthrow the Government of General José Santos Zelaya through the "Knox Note" of ill-fame. In 1914, in order to ensure Haiti's payment of a loan, the navy disembarked on the island, marched to the National Bank and took half the gold to the United States. In 1914, President Wilson ordered the navy to bombard and take the city of Veracruz during undeclared hostilities against Mexico.

44. In 1926, after abandoning the country for a few months, the Marines came back to occupy Nicaragua. This new military occupation lasted until 1933, when the Yankee troops were obliged to withdraw in the face of the heroic resistance of the defending army of national sovereignty led by Augusto César Sandino. In 1954, the United States, through the Central Intelligence Agency, overthrew the Government of General Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala. In 1961, the American military mission led a coup against a civilian-military junta in El Salvador of a nationalist character, and there was an invasion of Cuba in the Bay of Pigs by an army of exiles under the auspices of the United States which ended in failure. In 1964, American troops based in the Panama Canal Zone attacked a nationalist demonstration and murdered 30 Panamanians. In 1965, 22,000 troops disembarked in the Dominican Republic during civil unrest in that country. In 1979, the Secretary of State of the United States, at the 17th OAS meeting for consultations, called for a military intervention in Nicaragua to foil the popular Sandinist victory. American helicopters landed in Costa Rica in a plan to interfere in our war of liberation.

45. This history of interventions, placed side by side with the treaties and conventions under which the United States is bound and which it has violated, leads us to ask: by what right have we been so vexed? by what right have we been invaded? by what right has the status of protectorate been forced upon us? It has always been on the theory of the national security of the United States, excusing its acts of intervention for the protection of United States citizens, the protection of innocent lives, holding back chaos, helping to restore order and to create United States-type institutions, thus bringing, as a result, such policies and doctrines as manifest destiny, the Monroe Doctrine, the great stranglehold and dollar diplomacy.

46. General Smedley D. Butler vaunted the following:

> "I spent 33 years and four months in active service as a member of the mobile military troop of my country: the Marine Corps. During that period I spent most of my time working in high financial affairs for Wall Street and bankers. In sum I was an extortionist at the service of capitalism. I helped make Mexico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba decent places for the National City Bank boys to collect revenue in. From 1905 to 1912 I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped to make Honduras ripe for the American fruit companies in 1903."

47. The representative of the United States in this Council on 25 March 1983 [*2423rd meeting*]—this year, in other words—in accepting the interventionist, ill-fated policies of her country said that, fortunately, it was a new nation and had set aside any interventionist practice a long time ago. She similarly stated that "the United States indeed has no intention of invading anyone or of conducting an armed action against anyone, or of occupying any other country"* [*ibid., para. 168*]. Those words were spoken just a few short months ago in this same Security Council in reference to the region of Central America and the Caribbean.

48. It is also worth recalling the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which highlighted the importance of giving special attention to and persisting in endeavours to find peaceful settlements to disputes arising among member States of the Movement. It was stated that many such disputes and differences were exacerbated by former colonial Powers or were the outcome of imbalances imposed from outside, rather than a deliberate intent on the part of the States concerned to kindle animosity between them. Efforts to do away with such conditions and to establish equitable relations among States were one of the main motivations for the establishment of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

49. Today, mankind as a whole has witnessed the sincerity and "good will" expressed by the United States in the Security Council a few months ago. Grenada has been invaded and its people are being massacred. Innocent blood is being shed and the security of all the people of Grenada is imperilled.

50. In this regard, I should like to read out the communiqué issued by the Ministry of External Relations of the Republic of Nicaragua as a result of today's events. It reads as follows:

[*The speaker read the text of the annex to document S/16069.*]

51. The United States has shown its true colours once again. How long will mankind passively stand by in the face of these genocidal acts? The invasion of Grenada is a direct and inexcusable attack on peace-loving peoples and countries. We vigorously urge the Security Council to condemn that flagrant violation of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

52. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I obviously listened with interest to the extraordinary statement of the representative of Nicaragua which we have just heard. I should like to say that the United States does not accept as accurate, as a description of our role or of any conditions in the world, the statements of the Government of Nicaragua either in their letter to the President of the Security Council or in the remarks they just made.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

53. The United States would have preferred not to speak at all tonight and would not have, had there not been such an extraordinary distortion of our history, our policies and practices, and also of theirs. We are interested that the Government of Nicaragua is so agitated tonight, and agitated once again with fantasies of being invaded by the United States. I should like to say that in the realm of psychopathology those concerns are well understood. They fall in the realm of projection, and those who are subject to them are countries, for example, which cannot imagine behaving in any other way than in the ways they accuse others of behaving.

54. It is doubtless true that the Government of Nicaragua cannot imagine a Government having great strength and not using it against hapless, helpless neighbours. The Government of Nicaragua, having small strength, uses it in an uninhibited fashion against its neighbours and, imagining that everyone and all countries would behave in that way, is obviously concerned about having more powerful neighbours. It is trapped in the fantasies of dictatorships and locked—as Thomas Hobbes said—in a restless striving after power that ceases only in death.

55. The fact is that the United States really does not require lectures in constitutional law and the observation of treaties from the Government of Nicaragua. We are quite aware of the status of treaties in our own constitutional system, and we are a Government of laws. We freely and resolutely submit ourselves to our laws, to the disciplines of our laws and our courts, our legislatures and our populations who elect those legislatures to hold us to our own values and our promises.

56. As I have said here before, we could hope nothing better for the people of Nicaragua than that they be permitted, as a free electorate, to discuss their public issues, to choose their representatives, to elect their governors, to discuss public issues and to make their decisions.

57. I found it very interesting to hear the representative of the Nicaraguan Junta describe the various provisions of the Rio Treaty and the treaty of the OAS to which his Government, as well as mine, is a signatory. The Government of Nicaragua will, of course, have an opportunity to discuss those questions tomorrow in the OAS, where the OECS will be discussing the issues involved in the tragic events in Grenada.

58. I found it interesting to hear the representative of the Government of Nicaragua describe as unacceptable the decision of the States of the eastern Caribbean to invoke the treaty which binds them in a pact of mutual assistance as well as mutual respect for sovereignty, and he seemed to suggest that their size, the fact that they are small States, somehow rendered it inappropriate for them to have linked themselves to each other by treaty relationship, and even more inappropriate for them to have invoked the treaty which they had written and signed for their mutual protection.

59. I found it interesting to hear him refer to the United States having convoked a meeting of the CONDECA group. Once again, of course, the familiar disregard of history was present. The United States did no such thing. I found it interesting to hear him reproach the United States for lack of respect for the sovereignty and national independence of neighbouring States. In fact, the United States is meticulous in its respect for the sovereign rights of our neighbours and also for their national independence. We respect even the rights of our neighbours to make serious mistakes, as when they choose governments like that of the Government of Nicaragua.

60. We listened with interest as we heard the representative of the Government of Nicaragua reproach the United States Government today with every act ever committed by any citizen or even any inhabitant of our country since we either were or were not discovered by Columbus some 500 years ago. He mentioned William Walker, the interventions that—this is amusing—presumably prevented Panama's successful rebellion against Colombia. Of course, he forgot then to mention that the United States had also intervened in an earlier phase to help Panama establish itself in a rebellion against Colombia and to help it establish itself as an independent State.

61. The fact is that the relevance of these historic events in our country—some of which are indeed reprehensible, some of which are not reprehensible, and all of which constitute an absolutely biased and hysterically distorted history of the western hemisphere—again testifies only to the lack of any capacity for history as well as for present analysis. It never occurred to me in my most reflective moments, or condemnatory ones, as I reflected on the policy of the current Government of Nicaragua, for example, to reproach it with all of the crimes of the Somozist predecessors. It never really occurred to me to reproach the current Government of Nicaragua with all of the crimes of the oligarchs who governed that country for centuries and who repressed the peasants of that region. It never even really seriously occurred to me to reproach our Soviet colleagues for the excesses of some of their czarist predecessors.

62. But the representative of Nicaragua has introduced into our considerations here new standards of relevance. And so, at midnight tonight, we can reflect not on the events in the eastern Caribbean, not on the organization of the Government of Nicaragua or of its policies, and not on its more recent history, when it made solemn promises to the OAS, which promises it exploited and then discarded, and when it made solemn promises to its own people, which promises it profited from and then has cast aside and forgot. Frankly, it would not have occurred to me to discuss any of these issues at midnight, nor do I propose to linger over them. I do recommend, however, that if our colleague from Nicaragua is seriously interested in these questions of the application of the amendments and provisions of the Rio Treaty and the OAS founding act, that he pursue that in the appropriate arena, which, of course, happens to be the OAS.

63. Finally, I should like to say simply that the United States regrets the fact that we are meeting here tonight in clear violation of bourgeois conceptions of fairness to dis-

cuss this issue. We would have thought it more appropriate, as I said to my colleagues in informal consultations, to have conducted our discussions tomorrow morning, perhaps tomorrow afternoon, even to have honoured the normal practices of the Security Council and to have provided the head of State of the presidency of the OECS the opportunity to be present at the debate in which they are so deeply involved and by which they are affected.

64. The Security Council in its wisdom decided otherwise, reminding us once again perhaps that bourgeois conceptions of fairness are just that—bourgeois, liberal, democratic conceptions of fairness. But so then, of course, is the conception of the Security Council itself a residue of a liberal, democratic, bourgeois civilization and dream—a dream of nations meeting together, committed to peace, dedicated to the pursuit of fairness, ready to judge one another by the standards to which they are willing to submit.

65. This meeting tonight, and most especially the extraordinary statement of our Nicaraguan colleague, reminds us that these may indeed be outdated notions. But if these are outdated notions, so is this an outdated institution.

66. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to extend to you the sincerest congratulations of my delegation on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council in this troubled month of October. When we consider your patience and your well-known diplomatic skills, my delegation feels confident that the responsibilities of the Council under your stewardship will be efficiently and effectively discharged. The satisfaction which my delegation feels at seeing you presiding now is all the greater because of the relations of great friendship and solidarity which happily exist between the Governments of Jordan and Guyana.

67. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all those delegations which have paid tribute to me for my discharge of the duties of the presidency during the month of September.

68. In a statement issued in Georgetown on 20 October last, my President, Forbes Burnham, made public the deep grief and sense of shock which the people of Guyana felt at the death of the Prime Minister of Grenada, Mr. Maurice Bishop. Since those events, the situation in Grenada has deteriorated materially. There is now on Grenadian soil a foreign invasion force whose actions have led to great loss of life and extensive damage to property. Guyana, therefore, considers the convening of this meeting to be most timely. My delegation wishes to express its sympathy to the bereaved people of Grenada and also of Cuba on the losses they have today sustained.

69. Guyana has maintained a principled approach to the recent tragic events in Grenada. While expressing our profound grief at these developments, we nevertheless nourished the hope that the people of Grenada would seek to heal its wounds and, as a united nation, determine its future destiny within the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and in the wider international community.

70. As a general principle, Guyana is willing to participate in the mobilization of CARICOM forces to defend the integrity of any CARICOM State against an external aggressor. We are no less willing to participate in any CARICOM peace-keeping force in certain circumstances and under agreed terms of reference.

71. With specific regard to Grenada, however, we were, and continue to be, opposed to participation in any military invasion of Grenada, since such action constitutes interference in the internal affairs of that State.

72. We were of the view that the despatch of a fact-finding mission to Grenada, composed of CARICOM nationals, could be a helpful step. The point of contact for such a fact-finding mission would, of course, be the Governor-General as the legal authority of Grenada. We believe that the fact-finding mission, or whatever mechanisms to be agreed upon, should rest on certain clearly defined principles, among them: that no external elements should be involved in the search for a solution to the Grenada situation; that the solution should be regional in character, that is, formulated within the framework of CARICOM; that any solution must be fully in accordance with international law and with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations; and that the primary purpose of any regional solution would be the restoration of normalcy in Grenada.

73. The hostility which the United States Administration has felt towards the Government of the late Prime Minister Bishop and American concern about who Grenada's friends were are no secret to anyone in this chamber. What my delegation finds painfully disturbing is the fact that, at a moment when the States of our region are intensifying their efforts to have the Caribbean recognized as a zone of peace and to strengthen the security and independence of the States of our region, some of my CARICOM colleagues appear, by their action, to be endorsing this hostility towards Grenada and to be concurring in outside intervention in the affairs of the region. Such action can only be harmful to our region.

74. A policy of choosing governments for others and meting out punishment to those which are considered unacceptable is as alien to the political traditions of the Caribbean as were the disturbing events which occurred in Grenada last week. Guyana is not aware of the existence of any instrument or arrangement which authorizes intervention in any Caribbean State. Grenada posed no threat to any of its neighbours. My delegation understands that all foreigners on the island were safe and that at no time was their welfare in question.

75. According to the Chancellor of St. George's Medical College, American students had begun leaving the islands since yesterday afternoon without harassment or intimidation. The action being taken against Grenada is therefore in clear violation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, which states:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

76. My delegation has had cause to state in this forum in the past, and feels the need to so repeat, that in the relations between States, the strictest respect must be shown for the principles of international law. That is our only guarantee of peaceful and stable inter-State relations. Intervention as an instrument of State behaviour was long ago outlawed by the international community.

77. In 1970, the General Assembly, by resolution 2625 (XXV), adopted the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. That Declaration, taking the Charter as its point of departure, solemnly proclaimed the principle that States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations. It also sets forth the principle that States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

78. In December 1981, the General Assembly, by resolution 36/103, adopted the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States. That Declaration sets out, in unambiguous language, the duties comprehended in the principle of non-intervention and non-interference. Those duties include:

"The duty of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing [international] ... boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social, or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government, to cause tension between or among States or to deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage;

"...

"The duty of a State to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any ... form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force;

"...

"The duty of a State to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of another State or of any of its institutions."[4]

79. This Declaration enjoys the total support of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries because its principles are principles which have historically been a cornerstone of the Movement. We felt it was necessary to set them out in lucid declaratory form, as another protection for small States which are invariably the victims of aggression and intervention.

80. My delegation has this evening introduced a draft resolution [*S/16077*] which approaches the current situation in Grenada strictly from the perspective of the Charter of the United Nations, the time-honoured and sacred principles which lie at the heart of our international Organization, and the obligations on all States strictly to abide by these principles in their international behaviour.

81. Among other things, the draft resolution condemns the armed intervention in Grenada and calls for the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces. It calls on all States to show the strictest respect for Grenada's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and requests the Secretary-General closely to monitor the development of the situation and to report to the Council, within 48 hours, on the implementation of the resolution.

82. We are convinced that this draft resolution represents a worthy and credible response by the Council to the dangerous and critical situation existing in Grenada today. We remain open to receiving comments, observations and suggestions which could enable us to enhance the effectiveness of this response.

83. The tragic events of today give rise to implications and to concerns for all members of the international community. It is patently clear from the history of the Latin American region, dating back to the start of this century, that military interventionist policies do not resolve problems; in fact, those policies most often serve to perpetuate and to exacerbate problems and to create new problems. The real danger is that military actions mightr result in the creation of a new hotbed of tension, thus generating greater instability within the region.

84. The members of the Caribbean Community, which includes all the members of the OECS and other members of the expeditionary force, have long stated their acknowledgement that ideological pluralism is a reality and must be respected. The explanations advanced are at great variance with that stated belief for today's intervention. The need to tolerate other people's choice of developmental paths and choice of political strategy is the basis of respect for ideological pluralism. Thus the view expressed that the Government of Maurice Bishop was alien to the political environment of the Caribbean is a thinly disguised attempt by some States to impose their choice of political strategy upon another State. It is no coincidence that the chosen instrument for their imposition and intervention was the very super-Power which is diametrically opposed on ideological grounds to the Bishop Government. The question which now arises is whether the intervention is a reaction to events taking place after Mr. Bishop's death or whether it is designed to ensure the total demise of his legacy.

85. Guyana is genuinely concerned at the dangers which the present intervention generates. For when States arrogate to themselves the right to seek help to destroy the Governments of those States whose policies they find disagreeable, then who among us can feel safe? The claim has been advanced that this intervention is in pursuit of peace and democracy, but is not the true test of democracy in international relations the ability to tolerate those who do not follow our every whim or fancy, or the whims and fancies of our partners? If the international system cannot find it democratic and just that the small, the poor, the weak be protected from the powerful and from others, then I fear that, far from being democratic, we are instead submitting to a Hobbesian system which recognizes only the powerful and the fittest and their interests. Democracy has thus been poorly served in Grenada today.

86. With regard to the future, my delegation sees the adoption and implementation of the draft resolution we have proposed as a first step towards restoration of the normalcy in Grenada which we all desire.

87. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from Arabic)*: The next speaker is the representative of Grenada. I call upon him.

88. Mr. JACOBS (Grenada): I should like to start my presentation by reading the text of a telex that was sent from the Revolutionary Military Council of Grenada to the Embassy of the United States in Barbados on 24 October. The text is as follows:

"It is our information that at a meeting of some CARICOM Governments in Port of Spain, Trinidad, on Sunday, 23 October 1983, some of the participating Governments decided on establishing a military force to invade Grenada. In their decision they called for direct participation of extra-regional forces in invading Grenada. We are concerned because in many reports the name of the Government of the United States of America has been mentioned as participating in such a military force to invade our country. We also have concrete information that for the past 18 hours two warships have been patrolling between 12 and 15 kilometres off the shores of Grenada, well within our territorial waters.

"We would view any invasion of our country, whether based on the decisions of those CARICOM Governments, or on that of any other Government, as a rude violation of Grenada's sovereignty and of international law. Furthermore any such invasion can only lead to loss of lives of thousands of men, women and children. Therefore we strongly condemn such a decision.

"The present situation in Grenada is of an entirely internal and domestic nature, and presently peace, calm and good order prevail in our country. For these reasons we do not understand the basis or the reasons for the reported violent reaction of some Caribbean and other Governments. We view any threat or the use of force by any country or group of countries as a gross and unwarranted interference in the domestic affairs of our sovereign and independent country.

"Grenada has not threatened and is not threatening the use of force against any country, and we do not have such aspirations. Our armed forces and people are fully prepared to courageously defend the sovereignty and integrity of our country with dignity and determination. However, we are not seeking military confrontation with any country or group of countries, but, on the contrary, we are prepared to hold discussions with those countries in order to ensure good relations and mutual understanding and with a view to maintaining and strengthening the historic ties with all of these countries.

"We are also concerned about the reports that the Government of the United States of America is considering sending battleships to evacuate citizens of your country presently residing peacefully in Grenada. We reiterate that the lives, well-being and property of every American and other foreign citizen resident in Grenada are fully protected and guaranteed by our Government. However, any American or foreign citizen in our country who desires to leave Grenada for whatever reason can freely do so using the normal procedures through our airport and commercial aircraft. As far as we are concerned, these aircraft can be regular flights or charter flights, and we will facilitate them in every way we can.

"We have been further informed that 500 parents of American students studying in Grenada at the St. George's University School of Medicine today met in New York and unanimously agreed on a resolution calling on the United States of America not to take precipitate and provocative action against Grenada. We have also been informed during the last two hours"—at that time it was 2 a.m.—"by Dr. Geoffrey Bourne, Vice Chancellor of the St. George's School of Medicine, where most of your U.S. citizens are based, that less than 10 per cent of these students wish to leave Grenada at this time. In fact Dr. Bourne stated this in his own voice on Radio Free Grenada in a telephone conversation with the newsroom less than three hours ago.

"We further assure you that any U.S. and other foreign citizens who choose to leave Grenada in the coming days and who wish to return to Grenada in the future are welcome to do so. We are for peace, friendship and for maintaining the historically established ties between our countries and hope they would grow and strengthen.

"We further take this opportunity to inform your Government that the Revolutionary Military Council of Grenada has no desire or aspiration to rule the country. We are presently beginning the process of establishing a fully constituted civilian Government within 10 to 14 days. Such a Government would be broad-based, expressing the interests of all social classes and strata in our country. We have already held discussions with our

local Chamber of Commerce and industry, commercial bank managers and hoteliers as part of the process of constituting such a Government. Our civilian Government would pursue a policy of mixed economy, with State, co-operative and private sectors, and would encourage foreign and local investments within the framework of the national interests of the country.

"In closing we wish to state once more that there is absolutely no basis whatsoever for any country launching an invasion on our beloved homeland."

89. I said that that text was sent to the United States Embassy in Barbados on 24 October. As we meet on the morning of 26 October, we are faced with a very grave situation in the Caribbean—one which has been directly brought about by the intervention of the United States in the sovereign and independent country of Grenada.

90. Many of us have been hearing various excuses put forward for such action. Perhaps the most frequent is the statement that United States citizens were in danger in Grenada. Of course, from the text of the telex I have just read out, it is very clear that we had already assured the United States that no such danger existed. But further evidence exists suggesting that it was well known that there was no such danger to any United States citizens in Grenada at this time.

91. I can quote to the Council this evening a radio message telephoned from the same Chancellor of the University in St. George's, when he spoke to radio and televison reporters today here in the United States, in which he once again said unequivocally that there was never any danger to United States citizens or students associated with St. George's Medical School. Chancellor Modica said that any lives that may be lost in Grenada could only be on the hands of the President of the United States.

92. I think it is very clear that the pretext of protecting United States citizens was nothing more than a smokescreen that was put forward by the United States Government as an excuse for intervening in Grenada. In fact, this morning the President of the United States, Mr. Reagan, made a statement in which, despite the evidence, he once again said that one of the main reasons for United States troops having intervened in Grenada was to protect the safety of American citizens—in the face of the statement by Mr. Modica, in the face of the statements that had been coming over radio and television for some time, in the face of the statements of his own officials who visited from Barbados just two days ago and confirmed the safety of American citizens in Grenada.

93. But deception has become the name of the game, and so it was not surprising that Mr. Reagan carried the deception one step further. He has now tried to convince the world that he has intervened with United States troops under the alleged clauses of the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States—to which, incidentally, as our Nicaraguan friends mentioned, the United States has never been a signatory.

94. Nevertheless, let us explore that latest justification. There are some very interesting facts which have emerged and which we need to be clear on in regard to this alleged treaty. In the first instance, in referring to the treaty, Mr. Reagan said that it had been invoked by the eastern Caribbean parties to it because those States had thought it necessary to intervene in Grenada in order to restore some sense of democracy there. Such a concept cannot be accepted in this body because no one person or one nation has a definition of "democracy", as our friends from Guyana have correctly pointed out. This body has on many occasions accepted the principle of plural ideology among nations within it.

95. But, more than that, we must also look at the spurious explanation that was presented by Mr. Reagan in the company of Eugenia Charles for the intervention by the United States in association with some of these eastern Caribbean States. They said they were invoking article 8 of this treaty. The text of that article has been circulated to many members of the Security Council and I know that many of them have read it and are very baffled at how and under what pretext or circumstances it could be invoked as an excuse to intervene in Grenada.

96. As outlined in article 8, it is very clear that intervention can come only if there is a request from a member Government for such intervention and only if there is a threat of external intervention against that particular Government. I ask all members of the Security Council to look at that article for themselves, and they will have to search extensively to try and find any justification within that article for intervention by forces of eastern Caribbean States in association with the United States.

97. However, I think that is just another smokescreen for what is really happening in Grenada today, and I believe it is very important that we all be very clear on what is going on. There is no doubt in anyone's mind as to who is really behind the invasion of Grenada. Talk of a multinational force is a joke—an absolute joke—because over 95 per cent of the forces present in Grenada tonight are from the United States, and those forces are there in keeping with what has been the policy of the United States towards the people and the revolution of Grenada since 13 March 1979.

98. I should like to share with the Council a brief chronicle of some of the reactions of the United States to the Government and the people of Grenada during that period, if there is any doubt in anybody's mind about what has taken place and for what reason. Nobody should be surprised tonight at what has happened in Grenada. Nobody should be surprised that it is the United States that is in the forefront of the attack on the Grenada revolution. We simply have to look at the facts. Take the 1980 plot which was revealed in *The Washington Post* just six months ago—a plot which detailed an attempt by the United States to organize and execute the overthrow of the Government of the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada. We have to keep in mind too "Ocean Venture 1981" and "Ocean Venture 1982", which included, among other things, "Amber" and the "Amberines"—an exercise

that involved the mock invasion of an island off the coast of Puerto Rico called Vieques, an island very similar to the island of Grenada. It is not mere coincidence that the troops of the United States that are in Grenada tonight are those same troops that took part in those activities in "Ocean Venture 1981" and "Ocean Venture 1982", the Rangers.

99. We must be very clear on what is taking place in Grenada tonight, and we must understand very clearly that this is part of the activity and the plot the United States has been pursuing for some time. That is very clear.

100. But we do not have to look to the ancient history—if one may so describe it—of the past two or three years to see the evidence of what the United States is about in Grenada today. We must look at statements coming out of the Administration itself. I listened to President Reagan's press conference yesterday morning, and I assume that many members of the Security Council also listened to it. I heard him state specifically that the invasion of Grenada involving United States troops had been carried out at the request of the OECS. He said that he had received that request on Sunday and that he acted immediately. Yet within an hour the Administration publicly admitted on radio and television that as long ago as last week—Wednesday—preparations for the invasion of Grenada had been finalized. That is a matter of public record.

101. Later yesterday an Administration spokesman, Mr. Speakes, was quoted on radio and television as saying that actions against Grenada of both a covert and overt character had been stepped up considerably in the past two to three weeks in anticipation of what took place in Grenada.

102. The evidence is very clear, and it all points in one direction, the direction of the United States.

103. As a result of this gross, flagrant violation of Grenada's territorial integrity, the people of Grenada are tonight suffering untold hardships. Despite reports being issued by the United States, we have other reports that indicate many deaths. We have been receiving reports from our embassies around the world that as many as 700 people, many of them civilians, have been killed as a result of the attack launched by the United States.

104. It is well known that Grenada is a very small and poor country. It is well known that we could never be expected to be able to fight a country as big and as sophisticated as the United States. Therefore, it is not surprising that we are suffering heavy casualties. But, despite these things, we are continuing to fight and to resist the actions of the United States, and we look to our friends and to the international community generally to examine carefully what is happening in Grenada today and to ask themselves whether this is fair, whether it is the way in which to deal with international affairs in 1983. Are we to return to the period of the 1950s and 1960s? Are we to allow size and power to determine whether or not a country has the right to pursue its policies as it has chosen? Have we reached such a stage in the world today that no country can be allowed to pursue its policies without the dictates of another country, much bigger, thousands of times the size of our country, trying to tell us what we must do?

105. All of us must ask ourselves this, all of us, because the United States is one of the biggest countries in the world, and Grenada is one of the smallest, and many of the countries represented by those present in the chamber tonight, though bigger than Grenada, are much smaller than the United States. If today the United States can invade Grenada and impose a Government to its liking, international law has collapsed and the world will turn to anarchy. We cannot allow ourselves to sit back idly and let that happen.

106. Speaking on behalf of the people of Grenada and as a Grenadian, I am appealing to the international community to examine the situation very, very carefully. Whatever has happened in Grenada is an internal affair. Whatever arms the Grenada people and revolution have are arms to defend Grenada and the people of Grenada. We do not have the tanks, the navy and the air force that the United States is throwing at our people tonight, but we do feel that we have an international reputation, which we have demonstrated in international organizations over the past four and a half years, that deserves consideration when people look at what is happening. We have fought consistently and with principle in all international organizations, as many of those present tonight know.

107. We have no desire to fight with the United States. We have repeated that on many occasions, and, of course, we repeated it again on 24 October this year. However, it is very clear that in today's world the United States has decided that might is right, that nobody has the right to decide his destiny unless the United States feels that it is the correct destiny.

108. We appeal to the international body tonight to look at that situation. I ask those present to search their souls deeply and to ask themselves whether we can allow the world to run in this fashion. In making that appeal I ask the Security Council to condemn in the strongest language possible what has taken place in Grenada.

109. More than that, on behalf of the people of Grenada, who are tonight suffering an onslaught of untold terror, an attack that is costing hundreds and perhaps thousands of lives, I am asking the Security Council please to call for an immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces from our country. It is the only thing we can do. It is the only right thing. It is not fair for us to be subjected to this vicious and obviously planned attack. Twenty-one ships from the United States are present in our territorial waters. Tanks, bazookas and all kinds of sophisticated arms are being thrown at our people.

110. Reports tell of resistance, and I know that the people of Grenada are resisting tonight. But we must ask this international body to express its strongest condemnation, because, if we do not do that, what has happened in Grenada today could happen to any one of us tomorrow, and nobody can stop it once it starts.

111. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from Arabic)*: The next speaker is the representative of Cuba, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

112. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: On 20 October 1983, only five days ago, in the communiqué of the Communist Party and the Revolutionary Government of Cuba—which informed the Cuban people of the unfortunate events which had taken place in Grenada as a result of serious differences within the New Jewel Movement led by Mr. Maurice Bishop and which came to a tragic head on 19 October with the death of that individual and of several of his close assistants, all of them leaders of the Grenadian revolutionary process—Cuba stated its conviction that the situation brought about by these tragic events would be exploited by imperialism against the Grenadian revolution.

113. That conviction became a bloody reality in the early hours of 25 October, when forces of the United States Army and Marine Corps, along with a tiny group from some Caribbean States which had disgracefully joined in this act of aggression against a sister country, landed by air and by sea in the city of Saint George's and at other points on the island with the intention of overthrowing the Grenadian revolution and of returning the country to its previous abject condition of a puppet of Yankee imperialism.

114. In a press conference held this morning, the President of the United States stated with unheard-of cynicism, "This morning, forces from six Caribbean democracies and the United States began to disembark on the island of Grenada in the eastern Caribbean." This, according to the Yankee leader, was in response to the "urgent, formal request of five nations members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States to help them restore order and democracy in the island of Grenada."

115. It was with such an altruistic motive, and at the request of some members of an organization of which Grenada is a founding member—but to whose meeting last weekend it was not, of course, invited—but with the express opposition of Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago and Belize, that the imperialist United States Government, along with Barbados and Jamaica—which are not members of that organization but have acted as supernumeraries in the aggression—recklessly launched its Marines and soldiers, who are, to use a word of President Reagan's, the real gangsters of his so-called democracy, against the heroic people of little Grenada.

116. With characteristic impudence, the gentleman who sent Yankee troops, so he said, to defend the independence of Lebanon and who is now deeply mired in a shameful intervention in the internal affairs of that country, said this morning that he was taking action "constrained by events, and in order to protect American lives".

117. If what the representative of the Grenadian revolution said today before the Council were not enough, we might also recall that yesterday—or, I should say, the day before yesterday, for we are now into 26 October—the United States consul at Saint George's stated that the United States citizens there, including the medical students, were perfectly well. The representative of the Grenadian Government stated the same to the diplomatic representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, affirming that anyone who wanted to leave the country would be able to do so without any problem as soon as international flights were resumed on Monday.

118. Not a single press report of the last five days, not excluding those of United Press International, Associated Press and other well known United States press agencies, has indicated that a single United States citizen had in any way been attacked, injured or so much as touched in Grenada.

119. Furthermore, no Grenadian revolutionary has yet appealed for help from the Caribbean countries which have now leapt onto that country, like thieving jackals onto the prey of the tiger, and much less from the Yankee Government. These have all been the well-known and declared enemies of the Grenadian revolution since 1979. No Grenadian revolutionaries have even turned to their friends, to friendly countries, to help them solve the internal problems which have arisen in the last weeks and months.

120. How can a treaty to which Grenada itself is a signatory be invoked to call on the imperialist Yankee Government to invade that tiny country when there is not a single article in its text which can justify this perfidious aggression? Where is the threat to the security of the other States signatories? Where are the foreign mercenaries—unless they are the Yankee troops and the jackals unleashed by their reactionary hangers-on and miserable lackies against the people of Grenada—which are referred to in article 8 of the treaty being invoked? Was that treaty, indeed, ever registered with the United Nations? Everything points to the contrary. Therefore, in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, that treaty cannot be invoked before any organ of the United Nations. Therefore, even the shabby and minuscule fig-leaf with which they are trying to hide their interventionist shame is useless for their unspeakable purposes.

121. I shall not now make reference to the cries of the hyenas that we heard this morning from Washington or that were heard in the parliament in Kingston. The hyenas will not doubt feel satisfied with the kind applause of the tiger and the courtesies proffered in the retinue of treachery. It will not be long before they have to settle accounts with the peoples of the world, but we cannot fail to condemn as cynical and false the various statements made today, in an attempt to justify the unjustifiable, by the Secretary of State of the United States and by the President of that country himself.

122. What is beyond question is that Grenada—an independent, sovereign and non-aligned country and a full Member of the United Nations—has been the victim of an act of armed, unprovoked, unjustified aggression in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. It is beyond question that its territory has been

treacherously and brutally invaded by foreign forces led by a permanent member of this Council, the United States of America, which had not the slightest shame in once again trampling under foot the principles of this Organization.

123. With incredible gall, its representative in this Council informed the Secretary-General today in a letter [*S/16076*] that the United States was intervening to fill the "dangerous vacuum of authority now existing in Grenada", which was considered to be "a threat to the peace and security of the eastern Caribbean". What section of the Charter authorizes a State or group of States to intervene in the affairs of another State on the basis of a supposed "vacuum of authority" in that State? What international legal instrument characterizes a supposed power-vacuum in any country as a threat to the peace and security of another State? Where does contemporary psychopathology place such arguments?

124. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations unequivocally states:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

125. It is plain that the Government of the United States and the countries that serve as its henchmen in this ignominious chapter of American history have grossly, forcibly violated the political independence and territorial integrity of Grenada, acting in a manner inconsistent not only with the purposes but with the very letter of the Charter.

126. One need not have a very good memory to recall how, in much the same way as it has acted in Grenada, the United States invaded the Dominican Republic in 1965; how it used other Latin American henchmen to justify its intervention under so-called collective action; how, finally, it utilized the docile rubber stamp of its worn-out colonial office—also known as the OAS—to justify with the heading that insults the honour of our peoples its crime against the Dominican people. It was the same United States that invaded Mexico, taking more than 40 per cent of its territory, despite the protestations that we have heard today concerning the United States alleged respect for its neighbours. It was the same United States that trampled underfoot the nations of Sandino, Hostos and Martí, conspired in the last century against the great Latin American homeland of Simón Bolívar and set up house in Panama. It occupied Haiti and attacked Honduras; it overthrew the Governments of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala and Salvador Allende in Chile. The same United States shores up genocidal Governments in El Salvador and Guatemala and shamelessly commits acts of aggression against Nicaragua from neighbouring territory, threatens Cuba and proclaims military solutions for Central American problems in response to the peoples' rebellion against the famine, poverty and exploitation to which they have been subjected by the dominant oligarchies and Yankee monopolistic interests.

127. Thus Mr. Kissinger headed a mission to Central America precisely in order to declare that the only solution to the problems of Central America was the military one. And let the representative of the United States deny this if she can.

128. It was the same United States that lauched the mercenary invasion of the Bay of Pigs against my country, where it received its first great defeat in our continent. It is the same United States which is the close partner of the Israeli zionists and South African racists; yesterday's, today's and tomorrow's enemies of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America; the defenders of *apartheid*, the Ku Klux Klan, the "Big Stick" policy and the policy of force; the same country that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima because the Japanese are not white; the same ones who dropped more bombs on the heroic martyred people of Viet Nam then were used in the Second World War; it was the same United States which in its "Ocean Venture I" and "Ocean Venture II" in the occupied Puerto Rican island of Vieques, as just recalled by Mr. Jacobs of Grenada, rehearsed in minute detail today's sinister invasion of Grenada.

129. Those are the hangmen of the people of Grenada. Look them in the face, because one day they will be judged, just as the Nazi war criminals were at Nuremburg.

130. In the 20 October communiqué which I mentioned, the Communist Party and the Revolutionary Government of Cuba warned that we would not remove the group of about 1,000 Cuban workers—among them doctors, teachers, technicians and the members of a small military mission advising the Grenadian defence forces and giving assistance to the country—so as to avoid disruption of services essential to the population, although we would carefully examine future political relations with the new leaders of Grenada. It was precisely that group of Cubans, to whom Prime Minister Maurice Bishop had given light arms so that they might defend themselves against the oft-repeated threat of Yankee invasion, who in the early hours of today were the object of a cowardly, treacherous suprise attack launched by the Yankee army and navy, equipped with artillery, infantry, helicopters and airplanes.

131. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba has issued eight reports concerning the situation of the construction workers and advisers. The first indicated the commencement of the aggression, announcing that "at 0904 hours, Cuban time, on 25 October, an undetermined number of Cuban personnel were killed or wounded".

132. Beginning with that first report, the Revolutionary Government has kept the Cuban people informed of developments, as is its custom, stressing the heroic resistance of that small group of Cubans who had gone to that sister country to help it build a just and democratic society after the overthrow of the corrupt Yankee puppet Mr. Gairy. Together with the Grenadian people, they were steadfast in their defence of Grenada's territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, even in the face of superior forces and equipment.

133. At 2000 hours New York time on 25 October I received the following messages which had appeared in an official communiqué to the Cuban people, and which I read out this afternoon—or rather, yesterday afternoon—to the Secretary-General, on instruction of my Government:

> "As a follow-up to earlier information, the people are informed that at 1345 hours the chief of the Cuban construction workers and advisory personnel, Colonel Pedro Tortoló Comas, who had arrived in Grenada on a working visit yesterday, Monday, to take charge of all the Cuban personnel, reported that Yankee troops had taken one construction worker prisoner; they stated that they were not looking for problems with the Cubans and that therefore they were proposing the surrender of all Cuban personnel. Colonel Tortoló confirmed, however, that they would not surrender but would await the Commander-in-Chief's instructions. A few minutes later, jeeps armed with machine guns and cannon approached with Cuban hostages in front of them. Cuba responded: 'we congratulate you for your heroic resistance. The Cuban people is proud of you. You must not surrender for any reason. If the enemy sends Government representatives, listen to them and make your views known.' The reply of Colonel Tortoló at 1423 hours, Cuban time, was: 'Commander-in-Chief, we shall carry out your orders and will not surrender. Fatherland or death. We shall overcome.'"

134. At 2300 hours, New York time, on 25 October, just a few minutes ago, I received communiqué no. 8 from the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, which reads as follows:

> "The people were informed at nightfall of the continuing heroic resistance of our construction workers and advisers in the face of the attacks of the Yankee armed forces. The revolutionary morale and the determination to defend themselves with dignity were unswerving. According to various reports, the Grenadian combatants are continuing to offer tough resistance."

135. That is the attitude of the Cuban construction workers and advisory personnel. Our people sent them to Grenada to work with our brothers on that island to build a better future, free from exploitation, illiteracy and unemployment and from subjection to imperialism. We sent them there to build, together with the unforgettable Maurice Bishop, an airport so ardently desired by the people of Grenada—the airport which the United States had refused to finance and whose soil has been spattered with Cuban blood. All that blood, together with that of the Grenadian patriots, will forever suffocate, like that of Danton, the representatives of empire and those who join them in their crafty and cowardly aggression against our Caribbean brothers.

136. Cuba unequivocally condemns the invasion carried out by the United States against the Republic of Grenada as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. Cuba reiterates the right of the people of Grenada, and of all peoples, freely to determine their own future and to work for the political, economic and social system which they have freely chosen, and demands the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of American troops and their henchmen from the territory of Grenada.

137. The Security Council cannot allow the policy of aggression of the present United States Administration to govern the fate of the international community, whether in the Middle East, in southern Africa or in Latin America. The Council must see that the rule of law and justice prevail, for the security of all States, including the small, heroic island of Grenada which has been invaded. The monstrous events of today can be repeated tomorrow in any other country, in any other part of the world, unless the hand of the aggressor is stayed. The crime committed today in Grenada can be repeated tomorrow in Nicaragua, in Cuba, in El Salvador, in Angola, in Namibia, in any other place. The international community must give serious thought to the risk involved for all Member States if this act of aggression against a Member State is left unpunished.

138. Cuba—which, together with the vast majority of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, alerted world public opinion to the danger of invasion and aggression which hung over the Republic of Grenada just a few weeks ago, at the ministerial meeting at United Nations Headquarters—cannot but express indignation at the constant flouting of the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the repeated use or threat of force by the Government of the United States. That Government, further, violates instruments that the United States itself has brought into being, such as the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Río de Janeiro in 1947[5] and already smashed to pieces when it joined with the United Kingdom in its military venture against the Malvinas Islands.

139. We hope that members of the Security Council will fulfil their obligations under the Charter and that, like Mexico and Guyana today, Latin Americans firmly condemn this act of aggression against a small American country which, in the highest tradition of Juárez, Martí and Bolívar, has rejected the degrading yoke of servitude in favour of "the star that illuminates and kills". We hope to see the Council adopt the draft resolution submitted by Guyana.

140. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

141. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I thank you for giving me this opportunity, as representative of a small country and small people, to express our opinion concerning these dangerous events which we are witnessing.

142. I ask myself—because I am indeed baffled—are we at the end of the twentieth century? Is this really the end of the twentieth century or are we in the eighteenth or nine-

teenth century? Are we living in a jungle, or are we living in a civilized world? What are the laws which govern us? Are they international laws, international norms, the Charter of the United Nations, or the law of the jungle, the law of the cowboys? It is our right and it is the right of everyone to pose such questions.

143. What is the future of the Charter which has been desecrated and trampled by the feet of the aggressors, the invaders who, until this very moment, are butchering the sons of the people of tiny Grenada? What is the meaning of peace? What is the meaning of principle and freedom?

144. We have heard the voice of the victim. We have heard the representative of the people of Grenada, 100,000 people who are being subjected to murder, who are being massacred on their own land. Their only sin is that they have chosen their own system, a system which does not satisfy the United States of America, the largest Power on earth, because the United States wants these small peoples to become their agents. They want to stifle the voice of those small countries.

145. Grenada, this small country, is constructing an airport so that it may be exploited for tourism. This is a great crime, a crime because the United States cannot permit Grenada to construct an airport, and the President of the most powerful country in the world has repeated the danger posed by the airport of that small country whose population does not exceed 100,000. The danger posed to the United States, to the security of the United States? This is indeed a shame and a farce. If I were the representative of the United States, I would be ashamed to speak and to defend such a policy.

146. How does the United States justify its invasion of Grenada? To defend its citizens? Its citizens, according to the reports of its emissaries, are facing absolutely no danger. Are they defending democracy, restoring democracy to Grenada? What kind of democracy? Is this the democracy of Bishop who, from the beginning of his revolution up to the last moment, faced plots hatched by the American Administration? He visited this country personally so as to establish normal relations with the United States, but this was rejected; he was condemned and plots were fomented against him. What is the democracy which the United States wishes to restore to Grenada? The democracy of the jungle? The democracy of the Marines?

147. A few days ago we heard the United States President, Mr. Reagan, say that the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu because they did not have the warship *New Jersey*. But two days after he said this, over 200 Americans fell victim to their Government's policy—and yet the warship *New Jersey* was not very far away. The United States President forgot to remind us that his country too was defeated in Viet Nam at the hands of the Vietnamese heroes. But the American defeat in the Middle East at the hands of the Lebanese people, in Lebanon, has shaken the United States Administration at home. The American people and their representatives are crying out against this policy of international gangsterism and intervention. So the United States Administration must find some way to gain an easy victory—and this easy victory will be Grenada, a small country with a population not exceeding 100,000, which is less than the population of one or two New York skyscrapers. The United States must achieve a victory because the President requires this for his electoral purposes. Of course, he does not shrink from sacrificing thousands of Grenadians on the altar of American elections. This is the law of the jungle. What use is there for values and principles?

148. The United States Administration says that it was called upon to take this action by neighbouring countries. This is a new rule in international law that could be used tomorrow against Libya, if a certain country requested the United States Administration's intervention to change the régime in Libya, or Nicaragua, or any other small country. As the representative of the Grenadian people—the victim—has said, there are countries represented here that are larger than Grenada, but they are small when confronted by American imperialism. That is true. We shall all face the same fate if this aggression is not halted and condemned. What is the significance of the Security Council after all this? The security of whom? The security of the United States of America. If the task of the Security Council is to protect the United States in its perpetration of aggression and invasion, then it will have lost all meaning and should no longer exist. If, on the other hand, its task is to preserve the security of the peoples, of small countries, then it should clearly say so and discharge its duties under the Charter—that is, if we can even say that there is a Charter anymore. What kind of a Charter is it that is trampled by the United States Marines in a small country with a population not exceeding 100,000 and with a surface not exceeding a dozen square kilometres?

149. What is the future of peace and security in the world? What is the future of those peoples? Yesterday we celebrated an anniversary of the United Nations. What kind of gift did the United States give the United Nations? A typical cowboy gift: attacking a small country with a small population, butchering thousands of persons in Grenada and occupying that island. This is indeed an excellent gift from American imperialism. That is the way the United States celebrated United Nations Day. These are the values defended by the United States Administration.

150. I do not think that this is the time to talk about the Charter—a time when the forces of evil and oppression are killing thousands in Grenada. I shall not even refer to international conventions which have not been respected by the American Administration but rather were trampled under the feet of its soldiers, not in defence of the rights of Namibians against South African imperialism, not in defence of the Lebanese under the occupation of Israel, the strategic ally of the United States, not in defence of the right of peoples struggling for freedom; but to suppress freedom and to kill weak human beings.

151. Sometimes power is a source of self-respect and deterrence. Where the United States Administration is concerned, however, might is merely international gangsterism and colonialism, the killing of Lebanese, and ultimately

the annihilation of a small country with a population not exceeding 100,000. This is American policy. How much longer will this continue? Yesterday Nicaragua and Libya, the day before yesterday Viet Nam. Today Lebanon, today the people of little Grenada, whose voice we just heard. We are aware that this is perhaps the last time we shall hear a free voice from Grenada. Tomorrow the United States Administration will come up with a new, democratic Government to represent the Grenadian people, a Government installed by the Marines. We do not know for how long this American Marine Government will be in power, but the representative of that people is their last voice.

152. The representative of the United States has critized the Security Council for meeting this evening. She says that it should have waited until tomorrow. Indeed it should have—because the operation has not been completed, because resistance continues, and the United States Administration needs some more time to discharge its lofty humanitarian task and kill the largest possible number of people in Grenada. The Council was indeed wrong to meet this evening; it should have met tomorrow afternoon, as requested by the United States representative—and I would have hoped that she would be here to listen to my remarks.

153. Let us speak the truth, however bitter, however difficult—especially when the poor and the weak are involved. How difficult it is to speak the truth. But we must be courageous and speak the truth. We must say this to the United States: you have committed aggression against a small country. This aggression must be condemned. We must denounce the killing and destruction of a small population. Condemnation may not suffice. We have heard repeated condemnations here. The United Nations has adopted many resolutions condemning United States policy. Has the United States complied with any of them? Has it complied with resolutions of the Security Council, which it has paralyzed through use of the veto? The United States Administration continues to commit aggression and to encourage aggression.

154. Angola is unable to have recourse to its Cuban friends in order to defend itself against the South African invasion, but the United States Administration is entitled to restore and to defend democracy and individual freedom. The representative of the United States, instead of telling us what indeed has happened in Grenada and why it sent its navy to kill the people of Grenada, has tried to gain time and to make accusations against another victim of United States policy, the people of Nicaragua. The representative of the United States has delved into psychoanalysis and history. Perhaps the Grenadian people are psychologically sick and the United States wishes to treat them with the remedy that the United States sees fit. Who is really sick: one who has megalomania and the lust for power, who sends his forces everywhere to kill the innocent? Or is it the representative here of a small nation whose people are being butchered with the most sophisticated weapons, whose only fault is the desire to build an airport and to have a government that does not please the United States?

155. I do not think this is a time for words. It is a time for deeds. I do not want to prolong this statement, as I do not want to give additional justification or more time for the United States troops to kill more people of this small nation.

156. Before concluding, I should like to read out a message addressed by the leader of our revolution to you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council and to the Secretary-General:

> "What is unfolding today in Grenada has snuffed out any hope for the peoples of small countries, such as the people of Grenada, to live free on this earth. What is taking place in Grenada is not only killing the freedom of the people of Grenada but also murdering the civilization of the 20th century. It shows that it is a fraudulent civilization.
>
> "The existence of a person like President Reagan at the helm of a super-Power is an omen of the setting back of humanity and a return to the era of barbarism, the jungle and absurdity. The civilization and freedom of mankind are in their death throes and can be salvaged only through a worldwide international alliance to confront the United States itself and to reaffirm the principles of humanity, freedom and justice in it, and to exorcize the evil spirit and nazism from it, as they have become a peril to the small nations and for international peace."

157. The delegation of my country firmly condemns this ferocious and barbaric invasion by the United States Administration against the people of the small country of Grenada. We demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the invading forces from Grenada. We call on the Council to establish a fact-finding committee, so that the facts will be crystal clear to everyone and reveal this barbaric invasion. We demand the right of indemnity for the victimized people of that small country as a result of this barbaric invasion. Finally, I call upon you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council to shoulder your responsibilities at this critical moment, because not to take any action could mean the beginning of the end of the United Nations, its Charter and its principles and could start a new phase, the phase of the law of the jungle, with the strong gobbling up the weak, and hence the end of humanity.

158. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): At this time the Security Council is convened as a matter of urgency for the consideration of an act of aggression committed by the United States against Grenada. What we have here is an open, armed interference by the huge military machine of the Pentagon against a small sovereign State of the Caribbean, a non-aligned State and Member of the United Nations. The massive invasion of the island carried out by the United States Administration is a flagrant violation of the most elementary rules of international law and the lofty principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

159. It is well known that yesterday the United States perfidiously invaded the small island State, using large con-

tingents of ground, air and naval forces. According to the information received, the overt, completely unprovoked and totally unjustified intervention against the people of Grenada involves two United States operational and tactical groups which include approximately 20 naval vessels, 90 military aircraft and more than 2000 Marines. Having been planned in advance, these operations are supported by detachments of airborne units of the United States Army. Mercenaries recruited in a number of the countries of the region are also taking part in these operations.

160. Again, for the umpteenth time, the principles of sovereignty and independence have found themselves under the heels of the United States Marines. As the basic motive for the gross military interference the United States resorted to the false excuse frequently used by Washington earlier in various parts of the world, that of the protection of American lives, although it is well known that American citizens in Grenada were not threatened with any danger. In short, the American intervention against Grenada was covered up with exactly the same excuses as the intervention of the United States against the Dominican Republic in 1965, and of course many other similar examples can also be cited.

161. Yesterday morning from the White House one could again hear the usual cynical philosophizing about the "defence of democracy", American style. As in other parts of the world where peoples are trying to follow their own independent way, the path to such "democracies", of the Samozist and Pinochet type, is opened up with the bayonets of the United States Marines. It is quite clear that the actions of Marine units and of the airborne troops are designed, first of all, to bring about a restoration of United States domination of the island and the return to power of the anti-democratic régime that has been rejected by the people. We have here an attempt by force of arms to repress the will of the people of Grenada to independence and its right to determine its fate independently.

162. It is no secret to anyone that for precisely this reason Grenada for a long time has been the object of undisguised threats and pressure on the part of Washington.

163. This new criminal act of Washington is one further element in the sharp exacerbation of tension in the whole region of Central America and the Caribbean, together with the uninterrupted military manoeuvres and unprecedented military preparations, which have been carried out for more than a year. The purpose of all of this is to repress the national liberation movements and to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign States. The direct military intervention of the American forces poses a threat to Nicaragua, by the shores of Central America, where dozens of naval vessels are standing by and military contingents of United States troops are being transferred to the countries of the region. As a result of the aggressive actions of the United States there has been a sharp deterioration in the situation in this part of the world, and international tension has risen sharply.

164. In a statement made on 28 September the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Yuri Andropov, in describing the foreign policy course of the present United States Administration, called it a militarist one which represents a grave threat to peace, the essence of which is complete disregard for the interests of other peoples and States and the attempt to secure for the United States a dominant position in the world. The aggression against Grenada is a fresh example of this.

165. The representative of the United States made a rather signficant statement by declaring the Security Council, and apparently the United Nations, to be an outdated institution. The United States, of course, is entitled to adhere to this or that opinion concerning the United Nations. We merely wish to draw attention to the fact that this terminology was used in the past as well. It was used in the 1930s when first militaristic Japan and subsequently Nazi Germany and fascist Italy were abandoning the League of Nations, declaring that institution outdated as well. They left it because they needed to have their hands free for their aggressive actions. Apparently the laurels of those régimes leave no rest to some of the people in the present Washington Administration.

166. The Soviet Union most categorically condemns the aggression of American imperialism against a small non-aligned country.

167. The Security Council has before it a matter of principle; if today, now, we do not resolutely rebuff the aggressive lawlessness of the United States, no non-aligned State, especially if it has a policy, either internal or external, not to the liking of the White House, can find itself safe.

168. The Security Council must most resolutely and in the most emphatic fashion approach the present events in Grenada. We have a deliberately planned armed invasion by the United States carried out in cold blood. The United States has brought down its military fist upon a peaceful non-aligned country. The Council is called upon most categorically to condemn the armed intervention of Washington against Grenada as an act of aggression and a violation of international peace and security—in other words, an action which is a gross violation of the Charter—and to call for the immediate withdrawal of the interventionist forces of the United States and of their vassals from the island.

169. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table.

170. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to congratulate you upon presiding over the Security Council in this difficult month and to express to you our wishes for success.

171. Some may ask, at this late hour, why the representative of Democratic Yemen, which is continents away from Grenada, comes to speak before the Security Council. The answer to this question lies in the fact that the American

navy which invaded Grenada is present in the Arab Gulf, in the Mediterranean and everywhere. Everyone realizes the danger. For this reason, we come before the Council to speak about this new invasion, which is not the first of its kind.

172. We have heard the representative of Grenada and the other members of the Council, and we have heard the facts. At this late hour, I do not want to dwell on them, yet I would like to touch upon the realities. The first reality is that there is an American invasion of Grenada. The second reality is that the United States, throughout the past four years, has tried to prevent the people of Grenada from expressing their will and from enjoying relations with all States. The third reality is that the United States for a number of years has not ceased combatting Grenada politically and economically.

173. I did not come here to discuss the number of American troops which have attacked Grenada, but I would like to draw the attention of this Council to the justifications directly or indirectly provided by the United States for this invasion.

174. In the first place, we heard a few days ago from an official source, that is, the White House, that there was no danger facing American citizens in Grenada. Less than 48 hours later—or even 24 hours later—the United States concocted a pretext, namely, that the American citizens in Grenada were facing a danger. We in Democratic Yemen are not host to any American citizens. Perhaps one of the reasons is the fear that the presence of American citizens in any country could be exploited as a ready excuse to intervene in that country.

175. Furthermore, the United States provided other pretexts through the OECS, and a declaration was issued this morning to justify its invasion. We heard the representative of Grenada refute those allegations on legal grounds. I shall now deal with the political allegations as they refer to the declaration, and I should like to raise a number of points in that respect.

176. First, the OECS declaration was used to justify the American invasion because, it was stated, the situation was deteriorating in Grenada. Who is to decide whether an internal situation in any country is deteriorating or improving? Why did the United States not intervene in Cambodia when the Pol Pot régime perpetrated the infamous massacre of more than 3 million people? That abhorrent situation required all the countries to close ranks in order to intervene and save the Cambodian people. Not one drop of blood had been shed in Grenada, certainly not the blood of any American citizen. Nevertheless, the United States felt it necessary, by referring to the OECS declaration, to claim that the situation was deteriorating.

177. Secondly, the United States has attempted to justify its interference in and invasion of Grenada by claiming that Grenada had undertaken a military buildup in such a way as to cause an upset in the balance of power in the Caribbean region. How is the international community expected to accept such grounds? Who can decide how any State can arm itself or how it should carry out its policies? Is it not the right of every State, in accordance with the Charter, to defend itself and to establish the system of its choice? We heard the allegation concerning the upsetting of the balance of power. Is it not the United States which is attempting to tilt the balance of military power in the Middle East in favour of Israel? It even boasts that arming Israel will lead to peace and security in the region. How can we accept that type of justification? What would be the fate of any State that seeks to build and defend itself?

178. Thirdly, the United States claims that by virtue of the declaration, those States, including one called Montserrat, which still has not attained independence, have sought assistance from the United States because they did not possess sufficient strength to intervene in the affairs of Grenada. How can the United States present that pretext in order to cover up its operation, a pretext which could not find any justification in other parts of the world?

179. Fourthly, the United States has attempted, by using the OECS declaration, to justify its interference in and invasion of Grenada by claiming that they were within the context of a multinational force. Does that not remind us of what is taking place in the Middle East, in general, and in Lebanon in particular? If 95 per cent of the invading force comes from the United States—the Ranger forces—what kind of multinational force could it be? That is yet another American ploy. Under the name of a multinational force, the United States is trying to camouflage its invasion of other countries. Did not the United States invade Viet Nam under the same pretext? At that time the United States said there was a multinational force in Viet Nam, whereas at the time of the final outcome it became clear that it was the United States alone that invaded Viet Nam and later bore the consequences of that invasion.

180. Fifthly, the United States has used the declaration to attempt to justify its invasion by claiming that it wished to restore normalcy in Grenada. We ask: what are normal circumstances and what are abnormal circumstances? The American invasion of the island of Grenada is the height of political and military irregularity. It indeed contravenes all international laws and norms. The political arguments used in invoking that declaration reveal the flimsy grounds upon which the United States stands. What is that normal situation to which they refer? Is there a normal situation obtaining in Montserrat, a colonized country which we shall perhaps welcome in the United Nations in a few years? Is that not an absurd situation? Decolonization is the foremost task of the United Nations. The existence of colonialism in a number of countries is indeed an example of an irregular situation. When States exercise their right to choose their own political life, that right stems from the Charter, and that situation is indeed normal.

181. Sixthly, by using that same OECS declaration the United States has sought to justify its interference in and invasion of Grenada by claiming that they are to preserve peace and security. The declaration mentions that the United States and the so-called multinational force shall remain in Grenada until stability and peace are restored.

182. How can we understand such a concept? Is it the concept which the United States has in mind when it speaks about peace-keeping and when it brings up in all the committees the need to maintain such a force, and when it states that the main purpose of the United Nations is to establish peace through peace-keeping forces which are present here and there? Is this the example we and all the other States must follow? How can we interpret the role of the so-called peace-keeping forces everywhere if this indeed is the manner in which it is implemented? If this is indeed a peace-keeping force, is it not the right of the Security Council to establish such a force in conformity with the Charter, or does every State have the right to launch invasions under such pretexts?

183. These arguments and justifications presented by the United States through the OECS declaration are the only ones. In reply to a question this afternoon concerning the reasons for America's invasion of Grenada, Secretary of State Shultz stated that the United States has intervened in order to fill a vacuum. As if Grenada floats in outer space. This theory is the very theory which has led to numerous local, regional and world wars. If this theory of filling a vacuum should reign supreme, there are many who feel that there are lacunas which indeed need to be filled. The consequences of such a policy will only lead to destruction.

184. The problem in Grenada is the result of the new American Administration's policy under the Reagan leadership. Ever since the inauguration of this Administration, unprecedented tension has grown in the international atmosphere. The Administration has sought to encourage an increase in armaments and military buildups. It has tried to impose its hegemony everywhere, to the extent that American fleets have become like Trans World Airlines—present everywhere. This policy has led to the rise in tensions which we see today in Europe. This policy has led to the intervention in the affairs of Grenada, and this policy will continue to jeopardize international peace and security.

185. These words, which are pronounced by the representative of a small country, reflect the viewpoint of many countries which deem this American invasion of a small island a sinister omen indeed.

186. Democratic Yemen calls upon the Council to condemn unequivocally this American invasion. We call for a complete withdrawal of the invading forces. And finally, we exhort you to spare no effort to put an end to this blatant aggression.

187. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The last remarks I made were by way of a right of reply. I should like now to address the issue before the Council tonight as briefly as possible, since the hour is really very late.

188. I should like first to address the question: what were the conditions which the OECS, Jamaica, Barbados and the United States felt justified the action which is being considered here tonight? Certainly, the conditions were not any sort of abstract disapproval of the Government of Prime Minister Bishop, whom we have heard extolled tonight, who had, of course, already been murdered in cold blood. We make no firm charges about who was involved in the decisions to murder Prime Minister Bishop and his ministers in cold blood, although there is suggestive information concerning those questions. The facts are that, on 13 October, Prime Minister Bishop was placed under house arrest and subsequently, on 19 October, after he had been freed by a mass demonstration of Grenadians from house arrest and surrendered to the so-called Revolutionary Council, was shot in cold blood, along with five cabinent ministers and 12 other political leaders, who were killed at roughly the same time, creating one of the bloodiest struggles for power which the world has seen in some time.

189. The second question I would like to pose and respond very briefly to is: what are the objectives that the United States has in participating in this joint action? Those objectives are clear. United States troops are involved for the purpose of protecting United States citizens, to facilitate the evacuation of those citizens who wish to leave, and to provide support for the eastern Caribbean forces as they assist the people of Grenada in restoring order and establishing functioning governmental institutions. Any continued political involvement in this cooperative effort will be guided wholly by the views of the OECS and the Government being formed in Grenada. We fully expect that the deliberations in the OAS, which are scheduled to begin tomorrow, will be constructive and may prove useful to the future of Grenada.

190. The United States was also deeply concerned in evaluating the actual and potential danger to our citizens with the existence of a shoot-on-sight curfew. The shoot-on-sight curfew which threatened anyone who was seen in the streets of Grenada was, so far as we are able to determine, certainly the primary visible act of the so-called Revolutionary Council and constituted a clear and present danger to the security, safety and well-being of, among others, the Americans who had the misfortune to be in Grenada at the time these unfortunate events occurred. Also, obviously, they constituted a clear and present danger to the well-being of the Grenadians there.

191. Briefly, I should like to address the question: what constitutes the legal basis for the United States' action?

192. We responded to an urgent appeal by the OECS for assistance. The OECS is taking an action created under the treaty establishing the organization itself and consistent with the provisions of that treaty for collective security. I would note that the OECS member States are not a party to the Rio Treaty.[1] Their own organizational treaty is in effect the regional equivalent.

193. We believe that the support by the United States of the OECS is justified on a number of grounds. The OECS determined, as I said, that conditions in institutions of authority had degenerated and that a climate of fear, anxiety and acute danger to personal safety existed on the island. The OECS determined that a dangerous vacuum of authority constituted an unprecedented threat to the peace and security of the entire eastern Caribbean. The United

States Government believed that this judgement by the OECS was accurate and justified.

194. The objectives of the collective security force organized by the OECS are, we think, equally clear. They have been stated publicly on several occasions by OECS spokesmen, and presumably will be restated here tomorrow. They have also been stated by United States Government authorities, including the President of the United States and Secretary of State Shultz today. Those objectives are: to restore law and order, to help the people of Grenada to restore functioning institutions of government, to facilitate the departure of those who leave and, most especially, to put an end to the situation of acute threat to peace and security to the entire eastern Caribbean region.

195. We believe that the action is reasonable and proportionate to the deterioration of authority in Grenada and the threat that this posed to the peace and security of the eastern Caribbean. We believe it was and is consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of American States, since it aims only at the restoration of conditions of law and order fundamental to the enjoyment of basic human rights, which were so clearly not only in jeopardy but flagrantly violated in Grenada.

196. The United States is co-operating fully with the OECS countries in seeking a meeting of the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States to review the situation. We expect, of course, to continue to co-operate with our colleagues on the Council and with the spokesmen for the OECS when they arrive here to continue this discussion tomorrow.

The meeting rose on Wednesday, 26 October, at 2.25 a.m.

NOTES

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXIII, No. 3781.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. CLXXXVIII, No. 4350.

[3] *Ibid.*, No. 4351.

[4] General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex, part II, para. (a), (c) and (e).

[5] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 21, No. 324.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-60205—April 1992—2,050